



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. IV.—*M. T. Ciceronis Tusculanarum Quæstionum Libri Quinque. Ex Editionibus Oliveti et Ernesti. Accedunt Notæ Anglicæ. Curâ C. K. DILLAWAY, A. M. Philadelphia and Boston. 1842. Two Volumes.*

MR. DILLAWAY has lately sent forth two new volumes of his neat edition of Latin classics, containing the “Tusculan Questions” of Cicero. They correspond to the volumes previously published in their appearance, design, and execution. The text in this case, as well as in that of the previously published works of Cicero embraced in this collection, is stated to be “Ex Editionibus Oliveti et Ernesti.” We do not suppose this text to be the result of Mr. Dillaway’s own critical labors, but simply a reprint of the small London edition, frequently called the “Regent’s Edition,” which bears on the title-page the same declaration, with the addition “assiduâ recensione accurata.” Each volume is accompanied by notes of a miscellaneous character, intended to elucidate the thoughts and language of the author, and to explain historical, literary, and other allusions.

Before entering upon an examination of the manner in which the editor has executed his task, we feel bound to bear testimony to the zeal of Mr. Dillaway in bringing many works of the best Latin authors within the reach of young students in schools and colleges, and thus enabling these institutions to accomplish one of their objects,—the imparting of a knowledge of the Latin language by the use of many *different* authors,—a change no less beneficial, in our opinion, to the pupil, than agreeable to the instructor.

With regard to the text of this work, and of several others of Cicero, it cannot fail to be a cause of regret to every lover of that great Roman writer, that the editor has made a choice so little in accordance with both the claims and resources of the present day. The text of the Regent’s edition is a compound of that of Olivet and Ernesti, made by a person who is not even named, and on principles which the reader, unaided by any hint or observation of either editor or publisher, is left to gather, as best he may, from the work itself. There is no preface, there are no notes, stating when and for what reasons, in one case, the reading of Ernesti, in another, of Olivet, and in a third, of neither, is

adopted. The edition is, consequently, worthless in a critical point of view, whatever may be said in its favor on the ground of its neatness and typographical correctness. It may have been a very profitable speculation for the bookseller, but it is certainly a very unscholarlike production. If Mr. Dillaway had any reasons — and we cannot but suppose that such was the case, although he observes an unbroken silence on this subject — for resting satisfied with the results of criticism, in settling the text of Cicero, obtained nearly a hundred years ago, and for eschewing and ignoring the great progress made since then, he should have stated them ; but we must protest against his mode of proceeding, as a strange kind of literary and critical conservatism. If, as we have said, he preferred to take no notice of the labors of a series of illustrious scholars of the last three generations, we should have advised him to adopt either the text of Ernesti or of Olivet, and not contribute to spread and perpetuate such a critical hotch-potch as the Regent's edition.

The edition of Olivet enjoyed, for a considerable time, a great and extensive popularity ; but not so much on account of its merits, as because it was, after an interval of half a century, the first entire edition of Cicero's works ; the edition of Gronovius having appeared in 1692, and that of Olivet in 1740. Olivet does not even pretend to furnish a text of his own, based upon a careful examination of manuscripts, as well as editions ; he took the editions of Victorius, Manutius, Lambin, and Gruter, followed them when they agreed with each other, and selected some one of them when they disagreed. We state, in his own words, what he says of the use of manuscripts ; “ At enim, inquies, abstineri a codicibus manu scriptis non oportuit. Evidem, si res mihi sit cum scriptore plebeio, facile adducar, ut credam in bibliothecis latere chartas edentulas, quæ sint alicujus pretii. Verum de Cicerone quid esse spei reliquum potest, in quo jam a renascentium literarum seculo et typographicæ artis exortu studiosorum oculos ita defixit admiratio, ut quidquid in tenebris jaceret, eruere properaverint ? Atqui paucis post annis, et spirante adhuc Victorio, meliores unquam libros inveniri posse vix sperabant ; nunc, ne vix quidem.” Orelli, not only one of the first classical scholars of the age, and eminent for his acumen and circumspection as a critic, but a

man of liberal views, says of Olivet's edition ; “ Sed ista ipsa Oliveti recensio, præter ceteras, quæ nomen aliquod nactæ sunt, est arbitraria, negligens, omnis generis erroribus referata, exiguo denique cum judicio suscepta.” The edition of Ernesti, which appeared for the first time in 1737, is undoubtedly better than that of Olivet, although laboring under several defects. The great sin of Ernesti, as of other scholars since his time, was, that, having conceived some grammatical notions with regard to the language of Cicero, he did not hesitate to alter the text, in defiance of manuscripts and every other authority, whenever it was at variance with his preconceived ideas.

The situation of an American scholar in the exercise of classical criticism is, indeed, unfavorable. Our literary resources, though rapidly increasing, are still very incomplete. How few libraries are there in the country, which contain complete series of the principal editions of the Greek and Latin authors, not to mention manuscripts ! The distance of Europe, and the difficulty of procuring thence literary aid, are so great that, at present and for years to come, any independent and original activity on the part of American scholars in the field of classical criticism is scarcely to be thought of. But, such being the case, it is doubly the duty of one attempting to edit a classic, to avail himself of the assistance which is accessible to him. To use, in editing a work of Cicero, the text of Ernesti, or, what is still worse, the hybrid text of the Regent's edition, and scorn that of Orelli, seems to us an unjustifiable — we had almost said, wanton — disregard of what the scholarship of the nineteenth century has accomplished.

Our remarks, thus far, on the proper selection of a text, have had reference to the works of Cicero in general. Let us approach one step nearer, and see what are the available aids for preparing an edition of the “ *Tusculan Questions.* ” There is, in the first place, the edition of Davis, a man whose name will ever be mentioned with respect by all who know any thing about the philosophical works of Cicero ; we do not, of course, mean the second edition (1723), in which the text of Bentley, with all his ingenious but bold emendations, was adopted, which Davis himself abandoned in his third edition (1730), and returned almost entirely to his first text. Next comes the edition of F. A. Wolf, that

greatest of modern philologists, who boasted, and with reason too, that he could write as good Latin as Cicero himself ; who actually entered the lists against him, by furnishing a rival translation of the well known passage from *Phædo*, introduced by Cicero into the first book (cap. 41) of the “*Tusculan Questions*” ; and whose edition of the “*Tusculan Questions*,” as well as his lectures on them, are rich mines of classical lore. There is, also, that pattern of an edition by Kühner, who afterward adopted the text of Orelli — no light testimony in favor of the merits of that great scholar. Finally, there is the edition of Moser, a remarkable specimen of patient critical investigation. To neglect aids like these, and turn in preference to the Regent’s edition, is not even to stand still in the course of improvement, but to return to the errors and imperfections of a former age.

We could wish to illustrate our remarks on the text chosen by Mr. Dillaway, by examining some passages, but we must not encroach on the space wanted for some observations on his commentary. As it is, we shall not be able to extend our examination over the whole work. We prefer to subject a portion of it to a careful scrutiny, in order to judge thoroughly and fairly of Mr. Dillaway’s production, and to show both to our readers and the editor, that we have attentively perused his work, and formed our opinion from something more than merely skimming over its pages. We select for our purpose the first book.

In preparing an edition of a classic for the use of schools and colleges, it is no easy matter to observe, both in the quantity and quality of the notes, a due medium between too much and too little. The same authors are sometimes used, in different institutions, at different stages of the student’s progress. A commentary which may render the study of an author sufficiently easy for one kind of pupils, may not be full enough for another. The instructors, too, are of various qualifications ; some may be able to furnish a necessary explanation, which the pupil does not find in his edition, while others are as dependent on the assistance of the editor, as the pupils themselves. The same difficulties present themselves in judging of the adaptation of an edition to its object, in determining what notes are needed, and whether the notes given are too numerous or too few. The safest, and, indeed, the only way is, to judge of the book by the book itself,

to ascertain whether the editor is consistent in his supposition of the wants and resources of the student. If, for example, we find that common grammatical facts are explained, while nicer points, peculiarities of the writer or of his age, or of the class of writings to which the book belongs, are left unnoticed, or if the meaning of words and sentences which are comparatively easy is elucidated, while terms and passages presenting real difficulties are passed over in silence, we cannot avoid considering it as a very defective edition.

If we apply this fair rule to the commentary of the edition under consideration, we shall find it liable to considerable objections. In order to present the remarks, which we wish to make, in some kind of order, we shall arrange them in three groups, relating to the superfluities, deficiencies, and errors, of the commentary.

In the class of superfluous notes, we place a great portion of those relating to matters of history, biography, and antiquities. Some of them contain information which, we can reasonably suppose, is already possessed by pupils who read a book like this ; such are the enumeration of the higher deities (c. 13), the account of Phidias and his principal work (c. 15), the remark on the word *Avernus*, familiar to every schoolboy who has read Virgil (c. 16), the account of the golden fleece (c. 20), of the invention of the alphabet (c. 25), the remark on the use of garlands as an emblem of joy (c. 35), the account of the death of Brutus (c. 37), of the battle at Cannæ (c. 37), the note on embalming (c. 45), the account of the battle at Leuctra (c. 46). Other notes touch upon subjects which undoubtedly require explanation, but the information furnished is of too indefinite and unsatisfactory a description to be of much service. To this class belong those especially relating to the history of philosophy and literature, as on early poetry (c. 1), on Homer (c. 1),\* on "sedens" and "ambulans" (c. 4). Here, indeed, we are altogether at a loss to understand what Mr. Dillaway means. Does he intend to insinuate that Cicero carried his method as an eclectic so far as to adopt the manners and

---

\* To show, in one instance, what we mean, we will quote this note ; "Homer was born about 160 years after the destruction of Troy, and lived to the age of 104. So says Salianus; some think differently." What would Wolf and Nitzsch say to this?

habits of the leading philosophers, as well as their tenets ? We refer also to the notes on Roman funerals (c. 7), on Plato and his philosophy (c. 10), on atomical philosophy (c. 11), on Pyrrhus and Cyneas (c. 24), on the expression “quem Homerum philosophorum appellat” (c. 32) (where the point seems to be misapprehended), on Lysimachus (c. 43), and on Diogenes (c. 43).

Some of the notes, which contain references to other authors, are superfluous, either because they throw no light upon the passages to be explained, or they are inappropriate and inapposite. Of this kind is the note to “*eset tamen miseriæ finis is morte*” (c. 5); it is not easy to perceive what light the passage from Lucan, or the mention of the Ethics of Aristotle, throws upon the expression. The passage from Pliny (c. 9) does *not* prove the extension of the name Catus to all the *Ælii*, and is consequently superfluous. If the difference in the forms “*corculum*,” used by Ennius and Cicero, and “*corculus*,” used by Pliny, had been remarked upon, there would have been some object in the quotation. In the note on the opinion of Xenocrates (c. 10), not only the superfluity, but also the form of the quotation is to be noticed. Who would suspect, that, by Lucullus, Cicero is meant, who in one of the Academics puts this expression into the mouth of Lucullus, the principal interlocutor, from whom the book itself is named ? The quotations from Hieronymus (c. 12), from Pliny (c. 20), and from Juvenal (c. 22), might all have been omitted.

A more striking instance of an inapposite quotation is in c. 24. Neither the passage in Plautus, nor the one in Virgil, is precisely to the point. All three passages are, indeed, instances of *attraction*, but in a different degree. In this passage, and in similar ones, the subject of the relative clause becomes the object of the main clause ; “*Nam sanguinem, bilem, pituitam, ossa, nervos, venas, omnem* denique membrorum et totius corporis *figuram* videor posse *dicere*, unde concreta, et quo modo facta sint” ; instead of “*Nam sanguis, bilis, pituita, ossa, nervi, venæ, omnis* denique membrorum et totius corporis *figura*, videor posse *dicere*, unde concreta, et quo modo facta sint.” This kind of attraction occurs particularly with the verbs “*dicere*,” “*intelligere*,” “*opinari*,” “*metuere*” ; it is used in the language of common conversation, and occurs, therefore, fre-

quently in the comic writers, and sometimes in the familiar treatises and letters of Cicero. *De Nat. Deor.* 1, 26, would have been a passage in point ; “*Istud quasi corpus et sanguinem, quid sit, intelligis*” ; but, as there is a difference in the reading, we add another instance ; *Cic. Fam.* 4, 1 ; “*Rem vides, quo modo se habeat.*” It would lead us too far, to enter upon an explanation of passages such as those quoted from Plautus and Virgil. Suffice it to say, that both are instances of a bolder kind of attraction, inasmuch as “*Hos*” and “*urbem*” adopt the case of “*quos*” and “*quam,*” without being grammatically dependent on any verb or preposition.

In conclusion of this portion of our remarks, we point out two more quotations of a similar description ; one from Ovid, to the “*sphæra*” of Archimedes (c. 25), and the other from Virgil, where we are again at a loss to understand what resemblance there is between the “*duæ viæ*” of Cicero, or rather Socrates, and the two roads mentioned in Virgil’s description of the infernal regions.

To show how advantageously the space occupied by such superfluous or unsatisfactory notes might have been filled by others more useful, we will now turn to the second class of remarks, relating to the deficiencies or omissions of the commentary, and mention some passages wherein the assistance of the editor would have been appropriate and desirable to both older and younger readers. We regret especially the absence of notes pointing out and explaining many remarkable peculiarities of language. The book being a schoolbook, the object of the editor should have been not merely to confine himself to a meagre explanation of it, but to make it the occasion and vehicle of observations calculated to enlarge the student’s general knowledge of the language. We shall mention several passages as affording opportunities of this kind, but enter upon a full discussion of only a few. C. 1 ; “*et cum omnium artium, quæ ad rectam vivendi viam pertinerent, ratio et disciplina studio sapientiæ, quæ philosophia dicitur, contineretur*” ; here is a peculiarity of the Latin language, making “*quæ*” agree with “*philosophia*,” instead of “*studio*,” which is, logically, its antecedent. In the same chapter ; “*Jam illa, quæ natura, non literis, assecuti sunt, neque cum Græcia neque ulla cum gente sunt conferenda*” ; and “*quæ tam excellens in*

omni genere *virtus* in ullis fuit, ut sit cum *majoribus nostris* comparanda"; — instances of shortened comparison. C. 2; "At nos metiendi *ratiocinandique* utilitate hujus artis terminavimus modum"; a note might have been of service here. Mr. Otis, who has furnished the only English translation of this work, as far as we know, unless we consider as such a very incorrect attempt at a translation, which has lately appeared in one of our periodicals, misapprehends this sentence; he translates: "But we have advanced the limits of this art no further than its uses in surveying and *reasoning*," instead of "we have cultivated the science no further than it is useful in measuring and *calculating*." Notes would be useful at c. 4, on the meaning of "declamitare," and of "ad," in the sentence "ad id disputabam"; and at c. 6, on the meaning of "narrare," and, c. 7, of "imbuitus"; also, in the same chapter, on the sentence, "Omne *pronunciatum* (sic enim mihi in præsentia occurrit, ut appellarem ὄξιωμα; utar post alio, si invenero melius) *id ergo est pronunciatum, quod* est verum aut falsum," — an anacoluthon.

No one, who has read with any attention the philosophical works of Cicero, can have failed to notice the frequency of this anomalous formation of a sentence, and perceive that it arises from the easy conversational language in those treatises, allowing this graceful and pleasing irregularity, which would be out of place in a more elaborate form of composition. Kühner observes, very correctly; "Quod quidem negligentius dicendi genus cave putas ex scriptorum oscitantia et incogitantia ortum esse; immo vero dubitari vix potest, quin summi illi scriptores hanc negligentiam arte quadam ac dedita opera quæsiverint, eo quidem consilio, ut dialogorum rationem ad sermonum, quales colloquentes inter se spargunt, formam et veram naturam fingerent." It is not a little surprising, that, of all the anacolutha occurring in this book, some of which are quite striking, and by no means readily understood by a young student, not one is taken notice of. We shall mention the several instances, and make a few remarks upon them.

The anacoluthon is one of the points of Latin grammar, which, like so many others, has received more attention since a new impulse was given, through Wolf and his pupils and fellow-laborers, to the study of Greek grammar. Every

one acquainted with Greek knows how important a part the anacoluthon plays in the formation of Greek sentences. We refer those who may wish to refresh their knowledge of this subject, among other works, to Robinson's excellent translation of Buttmann's larger Grammar. Among modern Latin grammarians, Reisig and Grotewold are to be mentioned, as having treated most satisfactorily of this subject.

It is to be observed, in this place, that many editors of the works of Cicero, not understanding the nature, or not appreciating the advantage, of the anacoluthon, have attempted to alter the text, and, in no respect, perhaps, appears the superiority of the editions of Orelli, Zumpt, Kühner, Moser, and Wolf, more clearly than in those passages in which an anacoluthon occurs.

An anacoluthon is a sentence, the end of which does not grammatically correspond to the commencement. The occasion for using this liberty is, either the intervention of a parenthetical clause, or the great length of the first member of the sentence, especially when increased by dependent clauses, so that the reader may be supposed to have forgotten the form of the first member of the sentence. There are several classes of anacolutha, of which we will mention two. The first is, when, after the intervention of an intermediate clause, the continuation of the sentence is connected with, or made dependent on, the intermediate clause, instead of the first part of the main sentence. An anacoluthon of this description partakes, therefore, in some measure, of the nature of an attraction. An instance of this kind is in c. 30 ; "Itaque commemorat, ut cygni," etc. ; but, as it is one of those passages in which Mr. Dillaway has adopted the inferior reading of Olivet, "cygnis," in preference to Ernesti's text, we shall pass it by. We shall simply observe, that Lambin, being disturbed by the irregular progress of the sentence, if the reading "cygni," which is supported by the best manuscripts, were retained, changed it into "cygnis," an emendation which was adopted only by Bouhier and, through him, by Olivet. Another instance is in c. 36 ; "Hoc premendum etiam atque etiam est argumentum, *confirmato illo*, de quo, si mortales animi sunt, *dubitare non possumus*, *quin tantus interitus in morte sit*, ut ne minima quidem suspicio sensus relinquatur." The clause, "quoniam tantus interitus in morte sit," is made dependent on

“dubitare non possumus,” in the intermediate clause, instead of running thus, “tantum interitum in morte esse”; it being in fact dependent on “confirmato illo.”

The second class of anacolutha occurs when the second member of the sentence neither depends on the intermediate clause, nor corresponds, grammatically, to the first member. The first instance of this kind, occurring in this book, is the above, in c. 7; “Omne pronunciatum,” etc. If constructed regularly, the sentence would continue, after the parenthesis, “verum est aut falsum.”

A very striking case of this kind of anacoluthon is in c. 13, in which Mr. Dillaway again adopts the imperfect pointing of Olivet, instead of the better one of Ernesti. The passage, according to Orelli, is; “Ut porro firmissimum hoc afferri videtur, cur deos esse credamus, quod nulla gens tam fera, nemo omnium tam sit immanis, cuius mentem non imbuerit deorum opinio;—multi de diis prava sentiunt (id enim vitioso more effici solet); omnes tamen esse vim et naturam divinam arbitrantur; nec vero id collocutio hominum aut consensus effecit, non institutis opinio est confirmata, non legibus (omni autem in re consensio omnium gentium lex naturae putanda est);—quis est igitur, qui suorum mortem primum non eo lugeat, quod eos orbatos vita commodis arbitretur? Tolle hanc opinionem; luctum sustuleris. Nemo enim mæret suo incommodo; dolent fortasse et anguntur; sed illa lugubris lamentatio fletusque mærens ex eo est, quod eum, quem dileximus, vitae commodis privatum arbitramur idque sentire.” The argument of the passage runs thus; “As the existence of gods is proved by the fact, that no nation is found without the idea of a deity, (though this idea may, from various causes, be very imperfect), so the immortality of the soul is proved by the fact, that every one laments the death of his friends, because he thinks that they are deprived of the blessings of life, and conscious of that deprivation.” It is apparent, that the regular continuation of the sentence would have run, instead of “quis est igitur,” etc., “sic permanere animos arbitramur consensu omnium.” Forgetting that he commenced the sentence with a particle of comparison, Cicero gives to the apodosis, or second member,—which should correspond to the “ut firmissimum hoc afferri videtur,” and, therefore, proceed with “sic,”—the form of a question. The difficulty and obscurity of the

passage are increased, in the first place, by the circumstance, that the parenthesis, belonging to the first member, contains another parenthesis within itself, beginning with “*nec vero*” ; and, secondly, that the apodosis does not proceed straight on, but is, in its turn, interrupted by a second anacoluthon. The regular progress would be ; “*quis est, qui suorum mortem primum non eo lugeat, quod eos orbatis vitæ commodis arbitretur, deinde quod eos vitæ commodis privatos se sentire (arbitretur).*” It will be perceived, that, instead of pursuing this, its natural course, the sentence is broken in upon by the parenthetical clauses, “*Tolle hanc opinionem ; luctum sustuleris. Nemo enim mæret suo incommodo ; dolent fortasse et anguntur*” ; and, instead of continuing, as was clearly indicated, by the “*primum non eo, quod,*” etc., it closes with a second anacoluthon, “*sed illa lugubris,*” etc. Is it not remarkable, that a passage which, as our readers will perceive, taxes the knowledge, judgment, and attention of a mature scholar, is left without any explanation whatever ? Neither the thought, nor the language, elicits any remark. Mr. Otis fails, in his translation, to bring out with sufficient clearness the point of the argument.

Another anacoluthon occurs, c. 22 ; “*Quasi vero intelligent, qualis sit in ipso corpore, quæ conformatio, quæ magnitudo, qui locus ; ut, si jam possent in homine vivo cerni omnia, quæ nunc tecta sunt, casurusne in conspectum videatur animus, an tanta sit ejus tenuitas, ut fugiat aciem*” ; instead of, “*casurus esse in conspectum videatur.*” The “*ut*” is forgotten or neglected, and the sentence, which ought to depend upon it, is turned into a question.

The next anacoluthon occurs, c. 28 and 29. The passage is too long to be copied entire ; we shall give the leading clauses only ; “*Ut, cum videmus speciem . . . . hæc igitur et alia innumerabilia cum cernimus, possumusne dubitare, quin his præsit aliquis vel effector, si hæc nata sunt, ut Platonii videtur, vel, si semper fuerunt, ut Aristoteli placet, moderator tanti operis et muneris ? Sic mentem hominis, quamvis eam non videas, ut deum non vides ; tamen, ut deum agnoscis ex operibus ejus, sic ex memoria rerum et inventione et celeritate motus omnique pulchritudine virtutis, vim divinam mentis agnoscito.*” The argument is ; “ As we infer from the organization and government of the world, that a creator or ruler presides over it, although we cannot

see him ; so we infer the divine nature of the mind, although we cannot see it, from its manifestations." "Possumus dubitare," is instead of "non possumus dubitare," belonging to "ut," at the commencement of the passage. This instance, although not so complicated by far as the one previously mentioned, in c. 13, resembles it in the formation of its second member, the latter containing a second anacoluthon, "sic mentem hominis . . . vim divinam mentis agnosco," instead of "sic mentem hominis . . . divinam esse agnoscito."

C. 30. "Quod iis saepe usu venit, *qui cum acriter oculis* deficientem solem *intuerentur, ut* adspectum omnino amitterent ;" either for "qui, cum acriter oculis deficientem solem intuerentur, adspectum omnino amiserunt," or "qui acriter oculis deficientem solem intuentur, ut adspectum omnino amitterent." In this instance, Mr. Dillaway has, very properly, followed Ernesti, instead of Olivet, the latter partly adopting the reading of Lambin, who, in opposition to the manuscripts, altered the text thus ; "Qui acribus oculis." Olivet has, "qui acriter óculis," still omitting "cum."

C. 41. "Quamobrem *sive* sensus exstinguitur, morsque ei somno similis est, qui nonnunquam etiam sine visis somniorum placatissimam quietem affert ; dii boni, quid lucri est emori ! aut quam multi dies reperiri possunt, qui tali nocti anteponantur ! Cui si similis futura est perpetuitas omnis consequentis temporis, quis me beatior ? *Sin* vera sunt, quæ dicuntur," etc. "Sin vera sunt" is here used instead of "sive vera sunt" ; corresponding to "sive sensus," etc.

We have thus, purposely, dwelt somewhat at length upon several instances of the anacoluthon, in order to show that the cases of this anomalous construction are both sufficiently frequent and difficult to deserve some notice. We will now go on to treat, as briefly as possible, of some other omissions.

C. 8. "ut Siculi"; the twofold meaning of "ut," in elliptical expressions like the present, should be noticed, either corroborative, "as may be naturally supposed, since he was a Sicilian," or qualifying, as "considering that he was a Sicilian," "as far as a Sicilian can be so." In this instance, "ut" is used in the former, corroborative, sense. This is a use of "ut" which is frequently misapprehended. There is a striking instance of it in Hor. Sat. I. 6, 79 ; "In magno *ut* populo," "in as far as this (namely, to notice an individ-

ual) is possible in so great a population." It is erroneously explained in Anthon's edition. We will mention one other passage where; as in that from Horace, "ut" is used in a qualifying sense; Cic. de Senect. c. 4. "Multæ etiam, *ut* in homine Romano, literæ"; "great literary cultivation, considering that he was a Roman," or "as far as this can be expected of a Roman." Mr. Dillaway, in his edition of that treatise, has taken no notice of the expression.

Notes are needed, also, at the following passages. C. 8. "Quoniam, si (or 'Quia, quoniam,' according to the best editions and manuscripts) post mortem nihil est mali, ne mors quidem est malum; *cui proximum tempus est post mortem*, in quo mali nihil esse concedis." C. 11. "sed est difficile *confundere*." C. 13. "Tum denique, quam hoc *late pateat*, intelliges"; this expression is twice explained in Mr. Dillaway's edition of "De Officiis"; once (1, 2,) incorrectly, and once (1, 8,) correctly. C. 13. "ne-  
mo enim *maret*"; the difference of "*mæreo*" and "*doleo*." C. 14. "Specimen." C. 15. "Quid in hac re  
publica tot tantosque viros, ob rem publicam imperfectos, *co-  
gitasse* arbitramur?" iisdemne *ut* finibus nomen suum, quibus  
vita, terminaretur?" "ut" is dependent on "*cogitasse*." C. 15. "cum *inscribere* non liceret"; which Mr. Otis mis-  
translates. C. 16. "*Cujus ignoratio*"; "*cujus*" is the  
subjective genitive, referring to "*ratione*," "whose im-  
perfect cultivation." Mr. Otis's translation is incorrect.  
In the same chapter, "*νεκρομαντεῖα* faciebat"; is *νεκρομαντεῖα*  
used in its literal signification, "places for practising nec-  
romancy," and does "*faciebat*" mean *constructed*, or is it  
used for "*utebatur*," *he made use of?* A note is wanted  
for the phrase "*salso sanguine*," in the poetical quotation im-  
mediately following. Although we are by no means in favor  
of burdening the edition of an author, destined for the use  
of schools, with critical notes and investigations, yet there  
are exceptions, and this passage is one. Several manuscripts  
and most editions, especially the older, have "*salso*." In  
this case, "*salso sanguine*" is to be connected with "*ex-  
citantur*." Orelli retains "*salso*" in his text, but declares  
himself in favor of "*falso*," unless "*cassæ*" (belonging to  
"*imagines*") should be found to be the true reading. Mo-  
ser has "*falso*" in the text, without making even a remark.  
"*Salso*" is explained "by a victim ('*sanguis*' standing

poetically for ‘hostia’) strewed with salt (“mola”), or simply as an *epitheton ornans*, like ‘salsæ lacrimæ.’ ‘Fallso sanguine,’ without real blood.” Mr. Otis mistranslates, “defiled with gore.” C. 17. “ad universi cœli complexum”; Mr. Otis translates correctly, “in comparison to.” “Quatuor omnia gignentium corporum.” “Momenta,” motions, or laws of motion. Mr. Otis’s translation is unintelligible. “Ad pares angulos,” perpendicularly. Mr. Otis translates, “at equal angles.” “Illæ superiores.” “Non nomina-tata magis, quam non intellecta”; correctly translated by Mr. Otis. C. 19. “ignibus,” which Mr. Otis translates by “fires.” C. 20. “Etenim, si nunc aliquid assequi se putant, qui ostium Ponti viderunt”; the present infinitive, “assequi,” for the perfect, “assècitos esse,” though a precise expression of the thought would require the latter. In the same section, “nisi id agat.” This idiomatic expression, which occurs not infrequently, is nowhere explained. Mr. Otis mistranslates it, “unless it acts and attends”; “id” is not the nominative, but accusative. C. 22. “illa ratio.” C. 25. “institutiones.” C. 26. “nec in deo”; “nec” with the force of “ne quidem.” In the same section, “ut Jovi bibere ministraret.” C. 27. “quæ sola divina sunt,” “which has no other than a divine nature”; “sola” belonging to “divina,” not to “quæ.” C. 28. “quamquam id quoque”; “id” referring to “videre formam suam.” Mr. Otis’s translation is obscure. C. 29. “Muneris,” exhibition, spectacle, transferred from the amphitheatrical shows to the universe. “Nec interire igitur”; the unusual position of “igitur” after the second word is to be noticed, of which but few instances occur. “Diremptus,” an old form for “diremptio.” C. 31. “Tantum autem abest ab eo, ut malum mors sit, quod tibi dudum videbatur, ut verear, ne homini nihil sit non malum aliud certe, sed nihil bonum aliud potius; si quidem vel dii ipsi, vel cum diis futuri sumus,” one of the most difficult passages in the whole book, is passed by without any comment. C. 35. “honoratis.” Mr. Otis, following the reading “honoratus,” renders it “honored”; the word signifies “having held high offices,” “honores.” “Justa uxore.” “Nimirum etiam Puteolani”; the ironical force of “nimirum.” C. 36. “Valet hoc in vivis; mortuorum autem non modo vitæ commodis, sed ne vita quidem ipsa quisquam caret”; “non modo,” for “non

modo non," when followed by "ne quidem." C. 38. "non modo ipse." C. 39. "Cur." C. 42. "sine mutuatione et sine versura." C. 43. "si quid ei accidisset. C. 44. "At *illa* sicut acerbissimam rem mæret. Et *aliquando* sapiens Achilles. Cum multi inimicos etiam mortuos *pænitentur.*" C. 45. "Quantum autem consuetudini *famæque dandum sit*, id curent vivi." C. 46. "inutile." C. 48. "*Repetunt ab Erechtheo.*"

Many of the passages above mentioned have been only named, without a word of comment; for our object is not to write notes to the "Tusculan Questions," but to give our opinion of those of Mr. Dillaway.

Having thus stated both what the editor has done in his commentary, and what he has left undone, we may leave the case in the hands of our readers. From a comparison of the notes furnished by the editor, and those which should have been furnished, but are not, it will appear that the commentary is defective in consistency and uniformity. We beg our readers to recollect, that we do not set up a standard of our own, as to what the commentary should have accomplished, but we take the editor's own grounds. He has shown, by his own notes, what class of readers he had in view. If, in the passages explained by him, the pupil required his assistance, much more does he need it in those pointed out by us as neglected. Or, if the latter might be supposed to be intelligible without any aid of the editor, much more might the same supposition be made for the former. The book, it seems to us, is, in some measure, open to the charge, which can justly be made against so many editions of classical authors, of explaining at large easy matters, and leaving real difficulties unnoticed.

We must say a few words, in the last place, on those points wherein we think the editor is in error. C. 5. Concerning the meaning of the letters *M.* and *A.* Mr. Dillaway remarks; "Some commentators think that Cicero and Pomponius are the interlocutors in this dialogue." This is true; some do think so, but the passage quoted in support of this opinion, at most, proves only that *M.* refers to Cicero; it does not prove that *A.* refers to Atticus. Besides, after saying so much, Mr. Dillaway should have said a little more; namely, that other commentators not only explain the letter *A.* differently, (some "adolescens," others "audi-

tor), but they object expressly to making it refer to Atticus. Davis observes, very justly, that Atticus was at that time an old man, and the expression, "at tu adolescens" (2, 12), as well as the character of the dialogue, shows plainly that the second interlocutor is a young man.

C. 9. "Aliis cor ipsum animus videtur." The editor says ; "This was the common opinion of the Romans in the time of Cicero." Whence does the editor know this ? C. 10. The editor explains the term "vulgo," by *common* opinions. What does he mean ? "Vulgo" is evidently contrasted with "singuli," and signifies, therefore, *sects*, as "singuli" means *individual* philosophers. C. 13. "majorum gentium dii"; can there be any doubt that Cicero uses the term, "majorum gentium," as applying to the twelve higher deities, metaphorically ?

C. 13. The editor explains the passage, "reminiscere, quoniam es initiatus, quæ traduntur mysteriis,"—"recollect, since you have *begun* to be *imbued* with the knowledge of sacred things, what is delivered in the mysteries of *our* religion." The sense is ; "Recollect, since you have been *initiated*, what is taught in the (Eleusinian) mysteries." There is nothing which means, "to begin to be imbued with knowledge," nor were the Eleusinian mysteries a part of the Roman religion, to which alone the expression, "our religion," could be applied. There are traces of a tradition that Ceres was buried at Eleusis.

C. 17. "In sublime ferri." The editor says ; "Hence it follows, that they consider the soul corporeal, being one of the elements." Are we to understand that the soul is one of the elements, or what does it mean ? In the same section ; "Horum *igitur* aliquid animus est, nec tam vegeta mens aut in corde cerebrove, aut in Empedocleo sanguine demersa *jaceat*." We remark, in the first place, that both Olivet and Ernesti, from whom Mr. Dillaway's text is said to be derived, have "ne," instead of "nec." Now as to the interpretation. Mr. Dillaway explains the sentence thus ; "Nor *does* a mind, so active in its nature, lie immersed in the heart, or the brain, or, according to Empedocles, in the blood." The import of the passage is misapprehended. It is this ; "The mind, then, is some one of these (that is, 'igneus' or 'animalis,' or of that fifth, nameless, element); do not imagine, that, being of

so active a nature, it is immersed," etc. The subjunctive "jaceat" seems to have been overlooked ; or, it may be, that the note is derived from an edition which reads, " nec jacet" (for there are several which have this reading), while the text is that of another. As to Bouhier's emendation, mentioned by Mr. Dillaway, substituting " esto " for " est," " because the consequence implied in ' Horum *igitur* ali- quid animus est ' does not necessarily follow from what has been said before," the best thing we can do is to quote what Moser says of it ; " Bouhierius, nescio quid absurditatis subodorans, conjectit, *horum igitur aliiquid animus esto*, quia non recte intelligebat vocem *igitur*, quam dictam existimabat pro *ergo*, ut sit quasi conclusio syllogismi, huic loco non conveniens. Quem refutare necessarium non est."

C. 18. " *quorum alter ne condoluisse quidem unquam vi- detur, qui animum se habere non sentiat.*" What does the editor, or rather Pearce, from whom the remark is borrowed, mean, when he says ; " In this reading, Cicero does not tell us *why* Dicæarchus was not affected by grief " ? What else does, or can, " *qui*," with the subjunctive " *sentiat*," mean, than *because he did not perceive* ? Mr. Otis translates correctly, though stiffly ; " One of whom appears never to have even lamented, that he could not perceive himself to have a soul."

C. 24. " ' esset.' This word is to be understood in the Platonic, not in the popular sense." Are we to understand that Plato alone, and his disciples, used the verb *είναι* and " *esse* " in this sense, or what is meant by the " Platonic sense " ? C. 25. " ' nec me pudet, ut *istos*, fateri ne- scire, quod nesciam' ; ' ut *istos*, ' the disciples of Socrates." Not the disciples of Socrates, but other philosophers, are referred to, who, ashamed to acknowledge their ignorance, pretend to know what the soul is ; *I am not ashamed, as those are, to acknowledge my ignorance.* C. 33. " ' ut ego me tardiorum esse non moleste feram' ; ' so that I bear with repining.' " We suppose this to be a misprint for " *without* repining."

C. 35. " *Cum in aram confugisset.*" The editor says ; " A large altar stood in the open court *before* the door of Priam's palace," and quotes Virg. *Aen.* 2, 500 – 25. But that very passage, v. 512, shows that the altar spoken of was in a court *within* the palace, the " *impluvium* " of the Roman house, and that Priam and his family were not ex-

posed to the ruthless violence of Neoptolemus until the entrance to the palace was forced. In the same section ; “ ‘ vitam evitari ’ ; ‘ invitare ’ and ‘ evitare ’ anciently meant, ‘ to deprive of life,’ and also, ‘ to take away.’ ” Where and when does “ invitare ” mean “ to deprive of life ” ? As to “ evitare,” it may be derived from “ vita,” and signify, *to deprive of life* ; but others consider it a compound of “ vitare,” which has the signification, *to take away*, and also to *avoid*. See Schwenck’s “ Etymological Lexicon.”

C. 41. “ ‘ summi regis ’ ; Achilles.” This is probably a misprint for Agamemnon. In the same section ; “ ‘ nihil autem melius extremo ’ ; ‘ but nothing pleased me more.’ ” Why use the past tense, in speaking of a work which is before Cicero, and from which he has just made a long quotation ? Is it a misprint for *pleases* ?

C. 44. “ Ecce aliis exoritur e terra, qui matrem dormire non sinat.” It would have been well, if the editor had here consulted his friend Bouhier. The person referred to is neither Memnon, nor Polydorus, but Deiphilus, as is the case also in Hor. Sat. II. 3, 60, where Heindorf furnishes the correct explanation. The passage quoted is not from the “ Hecuba ” of Euripides, where the shade of Polydorus appears to his mother Hecuba ; but from the “ Iliona ” of Pacuvius, who followed a different tradition, given in Hyginus ; according to which, Iliona, Priam’s daughter, was married to Polymnestor, king of Thrace, and had by him a son, Deiphilus. Anxious for the safety of her brother Polydorus, who had been intrusted to her care by his parents, she exchanged the two children. After the destruction of Troy, Polymnestor, bribed by the Greeks, murdered his own son, supposing him to be Polydorus. In the tragedy of Pacuvius, the ghost of Deiphilus appears to his mother, and calls upon her to bury his body.

In point of typographical correctness, these volumes are quite respectable. Besides some instances, which we have mentioned as mistakes of the press, rather than of the editor, we have noticed only a few misprints ; as, on page 152, lines 6 and 13, for 18, read 17 ; p. 155, l. 5, for “ German,” read “ Greek ” ; p. 157, l. 15, for ἐντλέχεια read ἐντελέχεια ; p. 163, l. 9, for “ temples,” read “ temple ” ; on the same page, in the last line, for ὄγησ read ὄγης ; p. 173, l. 17, for “ stars,” read “ planets.”

We now close our remarks. By adopting the course which we have followed, of subjecting a portion of the book to a careful examination, we have, as we think, aided the reader in forming a just estimate of its merits, far more than by commenting in general terms on the whole. We have given, what an ingenuous and independent reader wants, — facts. We can, moreover, assure our readers, that, if they have made themselves acquainted with the character of this part of the book, they know that of the whole, and even of the preceding volumes of the series. Mr. Dillaway certainly adheres strictly to his original plan. Whatever the merits or defects of the plan may be, they characterize each volume of the series. We speak advisedly on this subject ; we have carefully examined all the volumes hitherto published, and could, if there were need, easily make good our statement.

We have given our views of Mr. Dillaway's labors with perfect frankness. He is laboring in a field, the right cultivation of which we deem of vital importance to the cause of sound learning. We have all, years ago, heard many and loud outcries against the study of the classics as a part of a liberal education. At that time, we expressed, in another place, our humble opinion, that this hostility was, in some measure, provoked by the imperfect manner in which classical studies were then pursued. But matters have, for some years, been improving. We can clearly perceive great ameliorations in the classical department of our schools and colleges, and proofs of a praiseworthy activity. The greater this activity is, the more important is it that it should receive and preserve a right direction. To contribute something to this end has been our object in these remarks.

---